

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GEORGE JARVIS AUSTIN,

Plaintiff,

v.

ABC LEGAL,

Defendant.

Case No. [21-cv-09076-SI](#)

**ORDER DENYING MOTIONS TO
AMEND/CORRECT**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 32, 44

Two motions remain pending before the Court in the above-captioned case. The first is a Motion to Amend/Correct directed at a Clerk's Notice,¹ entered by the Clerk on December 22, 2021, vacating a motion hearing that was set for December 23, 2021. Dkt. Nos. 32 (Motion); 31 (Clerk's Notice). The vacated hearing was scheduled by plaintiff, in contravention of Civil Local Rule 7-2(a)'s 35-day requirement, in a motion filed on December 17, 2021. Dkt. No. 27. The Clerk's Notice was thus proper, and the Court addressed the underlying motion in an Order issued on March 22, 2022. Dkt. No. 55. Thus, the first Motion to Amend/Correct is **DENIED** as moot.

The second is also captioned as a Motion to Amend/Correct, although the submitted paper is titled "Response & Motion for [Summary] Judgment for Plaintiff." Dkt. No. 44 at 1-2. The submission also includes an attached "First Amended Complaint," Dkt. No. 44-1, an "Appendix to FAC," Dkt. No. 44-2, and a proposed order granting "George Jarvis Austin's Motion for Leave to Amend, Reassignment, Mistrial, or Summary Judgment in Plaintiff's Favor." Dkt. No. 44-3. Despite the voluminous submissions, the Court is unsure what plaintiff is asking the Court to Amend

¹ The actual submitted papers, in contrast to the text of plaintiff's docket entry, include a complaint of criminal conspiracy, allegedly involving the undersigned, addressed to the FBI and DOJ. Dkt. No. 32 at 1. The submission also includes a Second Amended Complaint. *Id.* at 16.

1 or Reconsider. The motion is **DENIED**.

2
3 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

4 Dated: March 30, 2022



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge